

National Anti Doping Agency
J.L.N Stadium, Hall No. 103-104, First Floor,
Lodhi Road, New Delhi 110 003
Telefax: 011-24368274

To,

Date: 06.04.2026

Ms. Anjali Devi (Sports- Athletics),
D/o Shri Shamsher Singh,
R/o Kalwa Village, Tehsil Safidon
Jind, Haryana, India- 126112
Email: kunduanjali400m@gmail.com

Subj: Decision of the Anti-Doping Appeal Panel Case No.- 14/ADAP/2024.

NADA VS. Ms. Anjali Devi (ADAMS ID –DEANFA02990)

The order containing the decision of the Anti-Doping Appeal Panel dated 12.03.2026 in respect of the final hearing of the above case held on 27.10.2025 is enclosed.

The receipt of this communication may be acknowledged.

Encl: 6 Sheets.


(Yasir Arafat)

Sr. Programme Associate (Legal)

Copy forwarded together with the copy of the order containing the decision of the Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel for information and action deemed necessary:

1. The World Anti-Doping Agency, Stock Exchange Tower, 800 Place Victoria (Suit 1700) P. O. Box 180, Montreal (Quebec), H4Z 1B7, Canada.
2. Athletics Federation of India, G-3, Community Center, C Block, Naraina Vihar, New Delhi - 110028.
3. World Athletics Integrity Unit 1st Floor 6 Quai Antoine 1er MC 98007 Monaco.

**BEFORE THE ANTI-DOPING APPEAL PANEL
J.L.N. Stadium, Lodhi Road, New Delhi -110 003**

Appeal No. 14/ADAP/2024

(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH VIRTUAL MODE)

IN THE MATTER OF:

Ms. Anjali Devi APPELLANT
(Sport-Athletics)

Vs

National Anti-Doping Agency RESPONDENT

Quorum:

**Ms. Geetanjali Sharma, Chairman
Dr. Rana Chengappa, Member (Medical)
Ms. Rani Rampal, Member (Sports)**

Present: Adv. Niharika Tiwari, Adv. Ranjeet Pawar along with athlete in person
Mr. Yasir Arafat, LO, NADA

JUDGEMENT DATED 12th March 2026

1. The Appellant Ms. Anjali Devi has filed an appeal against the order dated 05.02.2024 passed by the Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel in Case No. 150.ADDP.2023 (“impugned order”). By way of the impugned order, the Athlete has been declared ineligible for 4 years w.e.f. 07.07.2023 on account of violation of Articles 2.1 and 2.2 of the National Anti-Doping Rules, 2021 (“Rules”).

2. Brief Facts of the Case:

i. That on 16.06.2023, in-competition doping control test of the Appellant was carried out during 62nd National Interstate Senior Athletics Championship, Bhubneshwar, Odisha by the Doping Control Officer of NADA. Urine Samples code no. 6503186 of the Appellant upon collection were sent to the Doping Control Laboratory, New Delhi, a World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA)-accredited laboratory. The Laboratory analysed the A Sample in accordance with the procedures set out in the WADA’s International Standard for Laboratories. Analysis of the A Sample returned an Adverse Analytical Finding (AAF) for the following:

“Hormone & Metabolic Modulators/GW 1516, Metabolites GW 1516 Sulfone, GW 1516 Sulfoxide”

Above substance is listed under S4 of WADA’s 2023 Prohibited List which are non-specified substances.

- ii. The athlete was notified of the adverse analytical findings via a notification dated 07.07.2023, whereby the athlete was informed about the AAF in her sample reports. The notification also highlighted the violation of Articles 2.1 and 2.2 of the National Anti-Doping Rule for the presence of “S4.4 Hormone & Metabolic Modulators/GW 1516, Metabolites GW 1516 Sulfone, GW 1516 Sulfoxide.” In terms of Article 7.4.1 of NADA ADR, athlete was provisionally suspended pending the resolution of her case.
- iii. Consequently, NADA issued a notice of charge dated 20.07.2023 for violation of Articles 2.1 & 2.2 of the National Anti-Doping Rules, 2021 (“ADR”).
- iv. The counsel of the athlete replied on the Notice of Charges on 09.08.2023.
- v. Subsequently submissions were made by both the parties before the Hon’ble ADDP.
- vi. By way of ADDP impugned order, an ineligibility of 04 years under Article 10.2.1.1 w.e.f. 07.07.2023 has been imposed upon the Athlete. Hence, this Appeal.

3. APPELLANT’S SUBMISSIONS:

- i. At the outset, the Counsel of the appellant contended that the athlete has never intentionally consumed any prohibited substance to gain an unfair competitive advantage and that she is completely innocent. Further, that the athlete has clean record in the past and this is the first incidence wherein she was charged for “ADRV”. It was also submitted by the counsel of the athlete that she always adhered to anti-doping rules and regulations and has demonstrated a consistent commitment to fair play and integrity in sports. That the athlete is a national level player who has represented India in several competitions and has qualified for the Asian Games.
- ii. The Counsel of the appellant further contended that, the presence of “*S4.4 Hormone & Metabolic Modulators/GW 1516, Metabolites GW 1516 Sulfone, GW 1516 Sulfoxide*” in the athlete’s sample was not the result of any deliberate attempt to enhance performance but rather a consequence of conspiracy and an act of active sabotage during her participation in 62nd National Inter State Senior Athletics Championship held from 15th to 19th June 2023 in Bhubneshwar, wherein on 15th June she participated in 400 meter and qualified for Asian Games in first round. On 16th June 2023 during warm-up session she fell down and got injured and a man holding water bottle came there and handed over the bottle to medical staff present there to wash her wounds and she also drank some water from the bottle as at that time she was not feeling well due to the injury. Hence, to prepare herself for semi-final round she used the water without any hesitation or thought about any kind of conspiracy against her and that water offered to her could be contaminated. Later on, she believed that the water could be contaminated and the reasons behind the athlete believe was that after semi-final round a few negative comments from the unknown ID appeared on her Instagram account stating that she need not to be too happy because after sometime she would be shocked due to big adverse master dope finding news against her from NADA. But, at first instance she ignored these comments thinking someone wanted to disturb her mentally.

- iii. That based on the facts stated above the present case falls under the cases of inadvertent consumption. Moreover, after winning gold medal in final round on 16th June 2023 her urine sample was collected by NADA in absence of any representative from her side at a place without any privacy.
- iv. That the Hon'ble Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel ("ADDP") in its' judgement failed to appreciate that the mistake on part of the athlete can only be construed as light degree of fault in view of the *CAS judgement in Martin Cilic* case because in the present case during the competition when she was participating on ground her bag having water bottle, protein shaker etc. remained unattended for a considerable time and she had observed that at the time of sample collection by DCO the colour of her urine was more yellowish. Hence she believes that her drink was spiked which led to Adverse Analytical Finding ("AAF") in her sample. The appellant believes that culprit behind the incidence of sabotage is one of her rival [REDACTED] because the man [REDACTED] who offered her water to wash wounds and drink was a well-known person of [REDACTED]
- v. That the "ADDP" failed to record vital facts and circumstances wherein the appellant athlete had filed a police complaint in Police Station, Nayapalli, Odisha for incidence of sabotage specifically in reference to the negative comments on her Instagram account and since then she has been running from Haryana to Odisha to find concrete evidence to prove her innocence.
- vi. The Counsel of the appellant further contended that the circumstances surrounding applicant ingestion of the prohibited substance in the instant matter warrants a finding of "*No Significant Fault or Negligence*" on her part; stating the possibility of sample sabotage at Doping Control Station because that area (Doping Control Station) was over-crowded and without any privacy which is against the Article of 6.3.2 of International Standard for the Testing and Investigations (ISTI) which provides:

"The DCO shall use a Doping Control Station which, at a minimum, ensures the Athlete's privacy and where possible is used solely as a Doping Control Station for the duration of the Sample Collection Session. The DCO shall record any significant deviations from these criteria. Should the DCO determine the Doping Control Station is unsuitable, they shall seek an alternative location which fulfils the minimum criteria."
- vii. The Counsel of the appellant relied upon Arbitrage *CAS 2014/A/3475 Van Snick c. Federation Internationale de Judo (FIJ)* wherein the athlete's contention was possibility of sabotage was accepted and two year ban imposed on the athlete was annulled.
- viii. The Counsel of the appellant further submitted that the Ld. Disciplinary Panel (ADDP) failed to appreciate that in the totality of circumstances prevailing during the event and at doping control station, the athlete bears "*No significant fault or negligence*" under Article 10.6.2 of the NADA Rules 2021.

- ix. That the valuable right of defence and fair hearing of the athlete was severely affected by not providing the concentration level of prohibited substance found in the sample of the athlete.
- x. Lastly, the appellant requested to allow the present appeal and set aside the Ld. Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel order dated 05.02.2024 or reduction of otherwise applicable period of ineligibility under the NADA Rules 2021.

4. RESPONDENT'S (NADA) SUBMISSIONS:

- i. The counsel on behalf the Respondent (NADA) submitted that in the present case, the Athlete has admitted the presence of *“S4.4 Hormone & Metabolic Modulators/GW 1516, Metabolites GW 1516 Sulfone, GW 1516 Sulfoxide”* in her sample. It is significant that no challenge has been levelled regarding the chain of custody, the integrity or reliability of the analytical procedures undertaken by the WADA-accredited laboratory, or any alleged departure from the International Standard for Laboratories.
- ii. It was further submitted that it is athlete's personal responsibility to ensure that no prohibited substance enter his/her body. The regime of strict liability, which forms the cornerstone of the anti-doping framework, renders considerations of intent, motive, purpose, or knowledge wholly irrelevant for the purposes of establishing an ADRV. The mere presence of a prohibited substance in the Athlete's bodily specimen suffices.
- iii. NADA submitted that the athlete tried to convince the presence of *“S4.4 Hormone & Metabolic Modulators/GW 1516, Metabolites GW 1516 Sulfone, GW 1516 Sulfoxide”* as an act of sabotage by a teammate in competition rivalry but could not provide any concrete convincing evidence in support of the alleged sabotage case. It is pertinent to note that a mere complaint lodged against a competitor cannot be considered as a cogent piece of evidence to substantiate the claim of sabotage. Moreover, such an assertion, even if taken at face value, is wholly insufficient to meet the evidentiary threshold under ADR.
- iv. The reliance placed on jurisprudence such as Marin Čilić, Cindy Potae, or similar precedents are entirely misplaced as the present matter concerns the deliberate consumption of prohibited substance/s (in the present case S4.4 Hormone & Metabolic Modulators/GW 1516, Metabolites GW 1516 Sulfone, GW 1516 Sulfoxide) a conduct that Ld. CAS has repeatedly held constitutes significant fault.
- v. In these circumstances, the finding of the Ld. Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel sanctioning the athlete with an ineligibility of 4 years as per Article 10.2.1.1 of the Anti-Doping Rules, 2021 is as per Rules and warrants no interference.

5. OBSERVATIONS, FINDINGS AND DECISION OF THE PANEL:

- i. The Panel has carefully considered the submissions made by the Appellant Athlete and the Respondent, the documentary evidence placed on record, and the applicable provisions of the National Anti-Doping Rules, 2021.
- ii. At the outset, the Panel notes that the Athlete's urine sample collected during the 62nd National Inter-State Senior Athletics Championship held from 15th to 19th June 2023 at Bhubaneswar tested positive for the prohibited substance "S4.4 Hormone & Metabolic Modulators – GW1516 and its metabolites GW1516 Sulfone and GW1516 Sulfoxide." The Athlete has not disputed the presence of the said prohibited substance in her sample.
- iii. The Panel observes that under Article 2.1 of the NADR, 2021, the presence of a prohibited substance or its metabolites in an athlete's sample constitutes an Anti-Doping Rule Violation. The anti-doping regime is based on the principle of strict liability, which places the responsibility on the athlete to ensure that no prohibited substance enters their body. Accordingly, the establishment of an ADRV does not require proof of intent, fault, negligence, or knowing use on the part of the athlete.
- iv. With regard to the Athlete's contention that the prohibited substance entered her system due to sabotage or contamination of the water bottle, the Panel notes that such a defence requires credible evidence. In the present case, the Athlete has relied upon the circumstances of an injury during the warm-up session, the provision of water by an unknown individual, and certain negative comments received on her social media account. However, the Panel finds that these assertions remain speculative in nature and are not supported by corroborative evidence that could establish the alleged sabotage.
- v. The Panel further observes that while the Athlete has filed a police complaint alleging sabotage, the mere lodging of such a complaint cannot by itself be treated as proof of the alleged act. No independent evidence has been produced to demonstrate that the sample or the Athlete's drink was tampered with by any third party.
- vi. With respect to the Athlete's argument regarding irregularities at the Doping Control Station, including lack of privacy and overcrowding, the Panel finds that the Athlete has not established that any departure from the International Standard for Testing and Investigations occurred in a manner that could reasonably have caused the Adverse Analytical Finding. In the absence of such proof, the integrity of the sample collection process cannot be questioned.
- vii. The Panel has also considered the reliance placed by the Athlete on jurisprudence such as the Marin Čilić case and the Van Snick v. FIJ decision of the Court of Arbitration for Sport. However, the Panel notes that the facts of those cases involved circumstances where the athlete was able to establish, on a balance of probabilities, the source of the prohibited substance or credible evidence of sabotage. In the present case, the Athlete

has failed to demonstrate the source of the prohibited substance or provide convincing proof supporting the theory of sabotage.

- viii. Consequently, the Panel finds that the Athlete has not discharged the burden of proof required under Articles 10.5 or 10.6 of the NADA Rules, 2021 to establish “No Significant Fault or Negligence.”
- ix. In view of the above findings, the Panel concludes that the Anti-Doping Rule Violation under Article 2.1 stands established. Accordingly, the sanction of four (4) years of ineligibility imposed under Article 10.2.1.1 of the NADR, 2021, commencing from 7th July 2023, is appropriate and justified.
- x. Therefore, the Panel finds no grounds to interfere with the order dated 05.02.2024 passed by the Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel (ADDP). Accordingly, the sanction imposed by the Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel vide order dated 05.02.2024, imposing a period of four (4) years of ineligibility upon the Athlete under Article 10.2.1.1 of the National Anti-Doping Rules, 2021, commencing from 07.07.2023, is hereby upheld.
- xi. The present appeal stands dismissed. All competitive results obtained by the Athlete during the relevant period shall remain disqualified in accordance with the applicable provisions of the NADA Anti-Doping Rules, 2021.
- xii. The appeal is disposed of accordingly.

Rana
Kanganda
Chengappa

Digitally signed by
Rana Kanganda
Chengappa
Date: 2026.03.18
12:50:36 +05'30'

Dr. Rana Chengappa
(Member Medical)

RANI

Digitally signed
by RANI
Date: 2026.03.23
16:07:07 +05'30'

Ms. Rani Rampal
(Member-Sports)

Ms. Geetanjali Sharma
(Chairman)